1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVES, PURPOSE AND NEED

The California Environmental Quality Act (the CEQA) Guidelines (section 15126.6.a) require that a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project must be described, analyzed and feasibly attain most of the basis objectives of the Project. Therefore, in order to explain the need for the proposed Project, and to guide in development and evaluation of alternatives, Chevron U.S.A., Inc. (Applicant or Chevron) was asked to define its project objectives. The Applicant identified the following objectives for the Chevron Richmond Long Wharf Marine Terminal Project (Project):

- The Project objective is to maintain the operation and viability of the Chevron Richmond Refinery (Refinery) by continuing current Chevron Richmond Long Wharf Marine Terminal (Long Wharf) operations through which the Refinery both receives its raw materials and exports its refined products. The Project is needed in order to continue Refinery operations. Without the use of the Long Wharf, the Refinery would not be viable and would be shut down.

1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EIR

Section 15124(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain a statement within the project description briefly describing the intended uses of the EIR. The State CEQA Guidelines indicate that the EIR should identify the ways in which the Lead Agency and any responsible agencies would use this document in their approval or permitting processes. The following discussion summarizes the roles of the agencies and the intended uses of the EIR.

The California State Lands Commission (CSLC) is serving as the Lead Agency responsible for preparing the EIR in consultation with other agencies and the public. The CSLC will use the EIR in determining whether to approve Chevron's proposal for a new 30-year lease of California sovereign lands.

The scope of the EIR covers the environmental impacts associated with operation of the Long Wharf with particular emphasis on oil transfer operations at the Long Wharf, vessel transit along shipping routes within San Francisco Bay and along the outer coast, and upset (accident) conditions. This EIR will provide the CSLC the information required to exercise its jurisdictional responsibilities in making its decision.

The proposed Project will also be reviewed by a number of State, Federal and / or local agencies as noted in Section 1.4 – Permits, Approvals and Regulatory Requirements.

1.2.1 Organization of the EIR

- Section 2.0, Description of the Proposed Project, describes the proposed Project, its location, layout and facilities, and presents an overview of its operation;

- Section 3.0, Alternatives and Cumulative Projects, describes the alternatives to the proposed Project carried forward for analysis, the alternatives that were considered but eliminated from detailed evaluation, and identifies the cumulative projects to be analyzed;

- Section 4.0, Existing Environment and Impact Analysis, describes existing environmental conditions within issue areas, project-specific impacts and mitigation measures, and the impact analysis of the alternatives. Section 4.0 also evaluates the impacts of the cumulative projects;

- Section 5.0, Other Required CEQA Sections, addresses other required CEQA elements;

- Section 6.0, Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program, presents the proposed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP);

- Section 7.0, Report Preparation Sources, presents information on the qualifications of those who prepared the report;

- Section 8.0, References, lists reference materials used to prepare the report;

- Section 9.0, List of Acronyms, includes a list of acronyms used in the report; and

- Appendices A-E to this Draft EIR contain the mailing list, the Notice of Preparation (NOP), copies of comments received on the NOP, and the location in the Draft EIR where the comments are addressed, and other technical reports used in the preparation of this Draft EIR.

1.2.2 Study Area Boundary

Refinery operations are separate from Long Wharf operations, and are not part of the proposed lease. Refinery operations are not under the jurisdiction of the CSLC, and are addressed only as they pertain to Long Wharf operations or to alternatives to the proposed Project.

The study area for this Project includes the San Francisco - San Pablo Bay region (the Bay or Bay Area), Carquinez Strait, and the outer coast of California. The study area has been further divided into three areas with three levels of analysis. The primary area, and the focus of the analyses, is the area with resources most likely to be affected by Long Wharf operations. This area is from the Bay Bridge north, including San Pablo Bay to Carquinez Bridge, and west to the Golden Gate Bridge, as shown in Figure 1.2-1.

Figure 1.2-1 – Study Area

Secondary areas of study include Carquinez Bridge into the Carquinez Strait and from the Bay Bridge south, encompassing all of south San Francisco Bay. The potential consequences of Long Wharf operations in these areas are addressed in lesser detail. The third level of analysis was conducted for the outer coast, with information from applicable previous environmental documentation included herein.

This EIR uses information for analysis from previous environmental documentation to the extent feasible. The EIR for Consideration of a New Lease for the Operation of a Crude Oil and Petroleum Product Marine Terminal on State Tide and Submerged Lands at Unocal's (now ConocoPhillips) San Francisco Refinery, Oleum, Contra Costa County (Chambers Group 1994), provided an extensive analysis of consequences on Bay resources. In addition, the Unocal EIR provided information on resources along the outer coast from Santa Cruz to the Oregon border from Unocal tankering operations. Therefore, some potential consequences on Bay and northern outer coast resources identified in the Chambers Group analysis (1994) could occur from the Long Wharf shipping operations because vessels traveling through the Golden Gate to San Pablo Bay and along the northern California coast follow the same shipping lanes. This EIR updates resource baseline conditions data. In addition, pertinent discussions of Bay and coastal resources and impacts identified in the Unocal EIR are summarized herein and incorporated by reference.

Impacts on marine resources resulting from the tankering of oil along the outer coast from San Francisco south to Santa Barbara were addressed in the GTC Gaviota Marine Terminal Project Final Supplemental EIR/EIS (Aspen Environmental Group 1992). This EIR incorporates pertinent information from the GTC document into this EIR. In addition, this EIR includes and references other recently prepared documents containing pertinent information relevant to this proposed Project.

Oil Spill Modeling

Major concerns associated with the proposed Project are the environmental consequences of oil spills at the Long Wharf, in the shipping lanes inside or outside the Bay, or elsewhere along transportation routes. The study area is rich in natural and public resources that could be severely affected by oil spills. One of the goals of this document is to provide mitigation measures for the prevention of oil spills during Long Wharf operations.

Because of the numerous sizes, types, and possible spill locations, combined with the seasonal variations in hydrodynamic flow conditions in the Bay and at the Long Wharf, the possible consequences of a spill could vary greatly. The methodology used in this EIR combined hydrodynamic and oil spill models with a Geographic Information System (GIS) to analyze and assess the potential for resource damage from oil spills. Because of the extent of past oil spill analyses, new oil spill analyses and resource assessments for this document have been limited to areas that approach the Long Wharf that are

outside of common shipping lanes, as well as at the Long Wharf. This EIR incorporates results of previous oil spill modeling and impacts on resources as contained in the Unocal (Chambers Group 1994) and GTC (Aspen Environmental Group 1992) EIRs.

Resource Mapping and GIS Analysis

Chambers Group updated resource mapping based on mapping conducted by the CSLC and Chambers Group for the Unocal EIR (Chambers Group 1994). Resource mapping involved a map-based delineation of relevant features of ecological interest or related importance, and the conversion of those features to a digital form on a standard 1:24,000 scale map.

Chambers Group incorporated new or modified resource features for the primary study area, and, to some extent, the secondary study area into the data map sets to provide a current set of maps for this study. These coverages were used to analyze potential impacts. GIS analysis was applied, primarily for oil spill scenarios, to produce output in tabular format, showing the amount of a resource (in acres or miles) affected by a particular scenario, depending on whether the GIS was measuring an areal (water surface) or a linear (shoreline) resource. Analysts were then able to visually assess and quantify potential environmental impacts.

1.2.3 Definition of Baseline and Future Conditions

When the original CSLC lease was granted to Chevron in 1947, the CEQA was not in place; therefore, no CEQA studies have been completed for construction of the Long Wharf or for operation of the Long Wharf. This EIR analyzes the environmental impacts associated with Long Wharf operations under the new lease. Granting of a new lease, the proposed Project, would allow Chevron to continue current operations for 30 more years.

The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15125(a)) require a description of the existing environmental setting in order to examine and analyze the effects of the proposed Project on the environment. Because the Long Wharf is currently in place and operational, this EIR examines the impact of continued Long Wharf operations on the existing environment and for the proposed lease period. The impact analyses measure the potential for impacts on existing environmental conditions resulting from 30 more years of operating the Long Wharf.

1.3 PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

1.3.1 Scoping

The CSLC, as Lead Agency in accordance with the provisions of the CEQA, determined that the proposed Project may result in potentially significant adverse environmental impacts, and therefore required preparation of this Draft EIR pursuant to and in accordance with the CEQA (Public Resources Code, section 21000 et seq.), the

State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, section 15000 et seq.), and the CSLC's guidelines implementing the CEQA.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was circulated by the CSLC from November 25, 1998, to January 1, 1999, pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines (sections 21080.4 and 15082(a)). The CSLC provided the NOP for the proposed Project to responsible and trustee agencies and to other interested parties. The NOP solicited both written and verbal comments on the EIR's scope during the comment period and provided information on a forthcoming public scoping meeting. The CSLC held a public and agency scoping meeting in the city of Richmond, California on December 10, 1998, to solicit verbal comments on the scope of the EIR.

Preparation of the Draft EIR was on hold for approximately three-years while the city of Richmond commissioned a feasibility study of Bay Trail routes to Point Molate which would potentially involve the Chevron Refinery shoreline property, and indirectly, the Long Wharf. A second delay occurred while the CSLC was preparing and finalizing the Marine Oil Terminal Engineering and Maintenance Standards (MOTEMS) which were approved in 2005. These standards were approved to mitigate the potential effects of future earthquakes and to ensure the safest possible operation of marine oil terminals. Several sections of the Draft EIR address safety issues and incorporate the requirements of MOTEMS.

Four persons spoke at the scoping meeting, and 12 written comment letters were received. Written comments were received in response to the NOP from the following:

- Lisa Hammon, Managing Director, West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee;
- Pete Livingston, Ph.D.;
- Martin McNair;
- Brian Wiese, Advance Planning, East Bay Regional Park District;
- Bruce Beyaert
- Niko Letunic, Bay Trail Planner, San Francisco Bay Trail
- Charlotte Robertson, Coastal Program Analyst, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
- Thomas K. Butt, Council Member, City of Richmond
- Robert Raburn, Chair East Bay Bicycle Coalition
- Larry Blevins, Plumbers and Steamfitters Local Union 342
- Debbi Landshoff, Executive Committee Chair, Sierra Club, West Contra Costa County Group of the San Francisco Bay Chapter
- Nancy Strauch, Trails for Richmond Action Committee
- Rosemary Corbin, Mayor of City of Richmond
- Assemblywoman Dion Aroner, California State Assembly, 14th District
- David Nesmith, Conservation Director, Save the Bay

A copy of the NOP, mailing list, meeting transcript, and letters received, as well as an index of where such comments are addressed in the document, are included in Appendix A.

1.3.2 Public Comment on the Draft EIR

This Draft EIR is being circulated to State and local agencies, and to interested individuals who may wish to review and comment on the report. Written comments may be submitted to the CSLC during the 45-day public review period. Verbal and written comments on this Draft EIR will be accepted at a noticed public meeting (either noticed in this document or under separate cover). All comments received will be addressed in a Finalizing addendum which, together with this Draft EIR, will constitute the Final EIR for the proposed Project.

This Draft EIR identifies the environmental impacts of the proposed Project on the existing environment, indicates how those impacts will be mitigated or avoided, and identifies and evaluates alternatives to the proposed Project. This document is intended to provide the CSLC the information required to exercise its jurisdictional responsibilities with respect to the proposed Project, which would be considered at a separate noticed public meeting of the CSLC.

The CEQA requires that a Lead Agency shall neither approve nor implement a project as proposed unless the significant environmental impacts have been reduced to an acceptable level. An acceptable level is defined as eliminating, avoiding or substantially lessening significant environmental effects to below a level of significance. If the Lead Agency approves the project, even though significant impacts identified in the final EIR cannot be fully mitigated, the Lead Agency must state in writing the reasons for its action. Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) must be included in the record of project approval and mentioned in the Notice of Determination (NOD).

1.4 PERMITS, APPROVALS AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

In addition to action by the CSLC, the proposed Project will require the following permits and approvals from reviewing authorities and regulatory agencies:

- BAAQMD Major Facility Review Permit (air quality) for Long Wharf and upland facilities;
- Department of the Army, U.S. Corps of Engineers (Corps) Permit for maintenance dredging and disposal;
- CSLC Marine Facilities Division (MFD), USCG, and State Fire Marshall inspection requirements;

- 2001 California Building Code, Parts 2 (Volumes 1 and 2) and Part 3. Note that the "Marine Oil Terminal Engineering and Maintenance Standards" (MOTEMS) is now Chapter 31F, of Part 2 of the CBC;

- CSLC and USCG regulations for an Oil Spill Response Plan and Operations Manual;

- USCG "Certificate of Adequacy" as an oily waste reception facility;

- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), Office of Oil Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR) regulations and guidelines for spill prevention, response planning and response capability; and,

- California Ballast Water Management for Control of Nonindigenous Species Act of 1999 and California Public Resources Code for ballast water management.